

## REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the disclosure on two grounds. First, the Examiner takes the position that the disclosure of the invention should be a brief summary of the invention. The Examiner adds that the disclosure of the invention should not reiterate the claims. Actually, no such guidance is provided, either by the rules of practice, notably 37 C. F. R. § 1.73:

“A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, should precede the detailed description. Such summary should, when set forth, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed;”

or by the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, notably M. P. E. P. § 608.01(d):

“Since the purpose of the brief summary of invention is to apprise the public, and more especially those interested in the particular art to which the invention relates, of the nature of the invention, the summary should be directed to the specific invention being claimed, in contradistinction to mere generalities which would be equally applicable to numerous preceding patents. That is, the subject matter of the invention should be described in one or more clear, concise sentences or paragraphs. Stereotyped general statements that would fit one application as well as another serve no useful purpose and may well be required to be canceled as surplusage, and, in the absence of any illuminating statement, replaced by statements that are directly on point as applicable exclusively to the case at hand.

“The brief summary, if properly written to set out the exact nature, operation, and purpose of the invention, will be of material assistance in aiding ready understanding of the patent in future searches. The brief summary should be more than a mere statement of the objects of the invention, which statement is also permissible under 37 CFR 1.73.”

Applicants submit that there is no more “brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance \* \* \* commensurate with the invention as claimed” (all as recommended by 37 C. F. R. § 1.73) than the narrative forms of the claims adopted by Applicants here. Applicants submit that there are no more “clear, concise sentences or paragraphs” describing “the subject matter of the invention” (all as recommended by M. P. E. P. § 608.01(d)) than the narrative forms of the claims adopted by Applicants here. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s objection to the form of the disclosure of the invention is overcome.

The Examiner further objected to the disclosure for its placement of a discussion of certain prior art in the detailed descriptions of illustrative embodiments section of the application. By amendments contained herein, the discussion of certain prior art has been deleted from the detailed description and added to the background section of the application. No new matter is sought to be entered by these amendments. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objection to the detailed descriptions of illustrative embodiments is overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon Luzzi U. S. Patent 4,955,823 (hereinafter Luzzi) to support this rejection. The Examiner calls Applicants' attention specifically to Luzzi's device 300 shown in Fig. 5.

Luzzi teaches a "method for connecting and disconnecting transformers and switches with cable systems which did not require the physical movement of the 600-Amp cable . . . ." (Luzzi, col. 1, lines 34-37). As shown in Luzzi's Fig. 5, a "T" shaped connector 50 and apparatus bushing 20 are fixed to wall 22 (Luzzi, col. 4, lines 35 and 39). A high voltage cable is joined to the "T" shaped connector 50 (Luzzi, col. 4, lines 31-32). Link 300 has a pair of frusto-conically shaped legs 154' and 156 (Luzzi, col. 4, lines 54-55). Legs 154' and 156 contain metallic tubes 206 and 208, respectively, that are joined by a bus bar 210 (Luzzi, col. 4, lines 55-57). When leg 156 is fully seated in receptacle 304 in arm 54 of the "T" shaped connector 50, an electrical contact is made (Luzzi, col. 4, lines 63-67). When leg 154' is fully seated in receptacle 308 of bushing extender 26, another electrical contact is made (Luzzi, col. 5, lines 4-5). When legs 154' and 156 enter or leave receptacles 308 and 304, the link 300 can be assembled or disassembled and therefore transformer and switches can be connected or disconnected.

Thus, Luzzi does not disclose or suggest claim 1's specifically recited  
"distribution device for distributing high magnitude electrical  
potential from an input port of the distribution device to a  
plurality of output ports thereof;"

or claim 12's specifically recited

"high magnitude potential supply system including a high  
magnitude potential supply having an output port at which a  
high magnitude potential is provided, a high magnitude  
potential distribution device having an input port and output  
ports, utilization devices, the output port of the high magnitude  
potential supply being coupled to the input port of the  
distribution device and respective output ports of the  
distribution device being coupled to respective utilization

devices.”


The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12 under 35 U. S. C § 102 is thus overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 8-11 and 13-15 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon Luzzi to support these rejections. Luzzi is deficient for its failure to show multiple output ports, as discussed above. Claims 4, 8-11 and 13-15 depend directly or indirectly from one or the other of claims 1 and 12. Claims 4, 8-11 and 13-15 therefore distinguish patentably from Luzzi for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration, culminating in allowance of all the claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be due to constitute this a timely response to the January 7, 2005 official action to Applicants’ undersigned counsel’s deposit account 10-0435 with reference to file number 3030-73043. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard D. Conard  
Registration No. 27321  
Attorney for Applicants

Indianapolis, Indiana  
(317) 231-7285

INDS02 RDC 721174